Advances.in
Reinventing Academic Publishing

Supplementary Materials for

Bélanger, J.J., Snook, D.W., Ahmed, M.R. & Adam-Troian, J. (2026). The radicalization syndrome: Reciprocal dynamics of obsessive passion and deliberate engagement. *advances.in/psychology*, 1, e912056. https://doi.org/10.56296/aip00067

Supplementary File

Contents

Study 1A – U.S. Democrats……1

1. Ideological Passion……1

2. Expo-12……1

3. Support for Political Violence……2

Study 1B – U.S. Republicans……3

1. Ideological Passion……3

2. Expo-12 (see Study 1A)……3

3. Support for Political Violence……3

Study 1C – Environmentalists……4

1. Ideological Passion……4

2. Expo-12 (see Study 1A)……5

3. Support for Political Violence……5

Study 1D – U.S. Muslims……5

1. Ideological Passion……5

2. Expo-12 (see Study 1A)……6

3. Support for Political Violence……6

Study 2 – U.S. Far-Right……6

1. Ideological Passion……6

2. Expo-12 (see Study 1A)……7

3. Support for Political Violence……7

Supplementary Tables……8

Table S1. Demographic Characteristics of the Study 1 and Study 2 Samples……8

Table S2. Study 1 Measurement Models: Four-Factor EXPO-12 Solution and the Seeking–Action Correlation……9

Table S3. Study 1 Measurement Models: Deliberate Engagement, Incidental Exposure, and Support for Violence……10

Table S4. Model-Building Sequence and Fit for the Random-Intercept Cross-Lagged Panel Models (Study 2, N = 593)……11

Table S5. Parameter Estimates for the Obsessive Passion–Deliberate Engagement RI-CLPM (Reported Model C; Study 2, N = 593)……12

Table S6. Parameter Estimates for the Obsessive Passion–Support for Political Violence RI-CLPM (Reported Model C; Study 2, N = 593)……13

Table S7. Robustness: Focal Estimates With Identity Fusion Added as a Trait-Level Covariate (Model D; Study 2, N = 593)……14

Table S8. Longitudinal Measurement Invariance Across the Three Waves (Study 2, N = 593)……15

Table S9. Monte Carlo Power Sensitivity for the Within-Person Obsessive Passion → Violence Cross-Lagged Path (Study 2)……16

Study 1A – U.S. Democrats

1. Ideological Passion

1. Not agree at all
2. Very slightly agree
3. Slightly agree
4. Moderately agree
5. Mostly agree
6. Strongly agree
7. Very Strongly agree

1. My involvement in the Democratic Party is well integrated into my life.
2. If I could, I would devote myself entirely to the Democratic Party.
3. My involvement in the Democratic Party is in harmony with other things that are part of me.
4. My involvement in the Democratic Party is so exciting that I sometimes lose control over it.
5. I have the impression that my involvement in the Democratic Party controls me.
6. My involvement in the Democratic Party is in harmony with the other activities in my life.
7. I have difficulties controlling my urge to think about the Democratic Party.
8. The new things I discover about the Democratic Party allow me to appreciate it even more.
9. I have almost an obsessive feeling for the Democratic Party.
10. My involvement in the Democratic Party reflects the qualities I like about myself.
11. My involvement in the Democratic Party allows me to live a variety of experiences.
12. The Democratic Party is the only thing that I can think of.
13. I invest a lot of time in the Democratic Party.
14. I like the Democratic Party.
15. The Democratic Party is important to me.
16. The Democratic Party is a passion for me.

Harmonious Passion = 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10
Obsessive Passion = 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12
Ideological Commitment = 13, 14, 15, 16

2. Expo-12

1. Never

2. Rarely
3. Occasionally
4. Sometimes
5. Frequently
6. Usually
7. Everyday

1. Searched for content online like websites, memes, or videos that support the use of violence to achieve political, religious, or social goals
2. Searched for places where people who support the use of violence to achieve political, religious, or social goals spend time
3. Searched for people or groups who support violence to achieve political, religious, or social goals
4. Chosen to meet face-to-face with people who support the use of violence to achieve political, religious, or social goals
5. Attended protests knowing people who support the use of violence to achieve political, religious, or social goals would be there
6. Searched for information on how to use weapons or make bombs for violence to achieve political, religious, or social goals
7. Accidentally came across content which supports violence to achieve political, religious, or social goals online
8. Received content online that you didn't ask for, such as memes or videos which violence to achieve political, religious, or social goals [item reproduced verbatim as administered; the omission of the word "support" was present in the administered survey]
9. Came across content online about using violence to achieve political, religious, or social goals while looking for content about something else
10. Noticed people where you live who support violence to achieve political, religious, or social goals
11. Noticed activity where you live that supports violence to achieve political, religious, or social goals
12. Noticed places where you live where activity that supports violence to achieve political, religious, or social goals takes place

Active seeking = 1, 2, 3
Active action = 4, 5, 6
Passive online = 7, 8, 9
Passive offline = 10, 11, 12

3. Support for Political Violence

1. Not agree at all
2. Very slightly agree
3. Slightly agree
4. Moderately agree
5. Mostly agree
6. Strongly agree
7. Very Strongly agree

1. Doing risky or illegal actions to help the Democratic Party win the next elections.
2. Harassing supporters of the Republican Party.
3. Physically attacking Republicans.
4. Destroying signs that support the Republican Party.
5. Using any means, even violent ones, to prevent the Republican Party from being elected.

Study 1B – U.S. Republicans

1. Ideological Passion

1. Not agree at all
2. Very slightly agree
3. Slightly agree
4. Moderately agree
5. Mostly agree
6. Strongly agree
7. Very Strongly agree

1. My involvement in the Republican Party is well integrated into my life.
2. If I could, I would devote myself entirely to the Republican Party.
3. My involvement in the Republican Party is in harmony with other things that are part of me.
4. My involvement in the Republican Party is so exciting that I sometimes lose control over it.
5. I have the impression that my involvement in the Republican Party controls me.
6. My involvement in the Republican Party is in harmony with the other activities in my life.
7. I have difficulties controlling my urge to think about the Republican Party.
8. The new things I discover about the Republican Party allow me to appreciate it even more.
9. I have almost an obsessive feeling for the Republican Party.
10. My involvement in the Republican Party reflects the qualities I like about myself.
11. My involvement in the Republican Party allows me to live a variety of experiences.
12. The Republican Party is the only thing that I can think of.
13. I invest a lot of time in the Republican Party.
14. I like the Republican Party.
15. The Republican Party is important to me.
16. The Republican Party is a passion for me.

Harmonious Passion = 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10
Obsessive Passion = 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12
Ideological Commitment = 13, 14, 15, 16

2. Expo-12 (see Study 1A)

3. Support for Political Violence

1. Not agree at all

2. Very slightly agree
3. Slightly agree
4. Moderately agree
5. Mostly agree
6. Strongly agree
7. Very Strongly agree

1. Doing risky or illegal actions to prevent the Democratic Party from winning the next elections.
2. Harassing supporters of the Democratic Party.
3. Physically attacking Democrats.
4. Destroying signs that support the Democratic Party.
5. Using any means, even violent ones, to prevent the Democratic Party from being elected.

Study 1C – Environmentalists

1. Ideological Passion

1. Not agree at all
2. Very slightly agree
3. Slightly agree
4. Moderately agree
5. Mostly agree
6. Strongly agree
7. Very Strongly agree

1. My involvement in the environmental cause is in harmony with the other activities in my life.
2. I have difficulties controlling my urge to be involved in the environmental cause.
3. The new things that I discover about my involvement in the environmental cause allow me to appreciate it even more.
4. I have almost an obsessive feeling for being involved in the environmental cause.
5. My involvement in the environmental cause reflects the qualities I like about myself.
6. My involvement in the environmental cause allows me to live a variety of experiences.
7. My involvement in the environmental cause is the only thing that captivates me.
8. My involvement in the environmental cause is well integrated into my life.
9. If I could, I would only keep getting involved in the environmental cause.
10. My involvement in the environmental cause is in harmony with other things that are part of me.
11. My involvement in the environmental cause is so exciting that I sometimes lose control over it.
12. I have the impression that my involvement in the environmental cause controls me.
13. I spend a lot of time being involved in the environmental cause.
14. I like the environmental cause.
15. The environmental cause is important to me.
16. The environmental cause is a passion for me.

Harmonious Passion = 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10
Obsessive Passion = 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12
Ideological Commitment = 13, 14, 15, 16

2. Expo-12 (see Study 1A)

3. Support for Political Violence

1. Not agree at all
2. Very slightly agree
3. Slightly agree
4. Moderately agree
5. Mostly agree
6. Strongly agree
7. Very Strongly agree

1. Joining a radical activist group to do risky or illegal actions in order to help the environmental cause.
2. Forming a radical group to crack down on polluting businesses.
3. Physically attacking a representative of a polluting factory.
4. Appealing to acts of sabotage against installations that harm the environment.
5. Using any means, even violent ones, to help the environmental cause.

Study 1D – U.S. Muslims

1. Ideological Passion

1. Not agree at all
2. Very slightly agree
3. Slightly agree
4. Moderately agree
5. Mostly agree
6. Strongly agree
7. Very Strongly agree

1. Islam is in harmony with the other activities in my life.
2. I have difficulties controlling my urge to think about Islam.
3. The new things I discover with Islam allow me to appreciate it even more.
4. I have almost an obsessive feeling for Islam.
5. Islam reflects the qualities I like about myself.
6. Islam allows me to live a variety of experiences.
7. Islam is the only thing that captivates me.
8. Islam is well integrated into my life.
9. If I could, I would devote myself entirely to Islam.
10. Islam is in harmony with other things that are part of me.
11. Islam is so exciting that I sometimes lose control over it.

12. I have the impression that Islam controls me.
13. I spend a lot of time thinking about Islam.
14. I like Islam.
15. Islam is important to me.
16. Islam is a passion for me.

Harmonious Passion = 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10
Obsessive Passion = 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12
Ideological Commitment = 13, 14, 15, 16

2. Expo-12 (see Study 1A)

3. Support for Political Violence

1. Not agree at all
2. Very slightly agree
3. Slightly agree
4. Moderately agree
5. Mostly agree
6. Strongly agree
7. Very Strongly agree

1. Doing risky or illegal actions to further the cause of Islam.
2. Harassing people who ridicule or oppose Islam.
3. Physically people who ridicule or oppose Islam.
4. Destroying signs that ridicule or oppose Islam.
5. Using any means, even violent ones, to further the cause of Islam.

Study 2 – U.S. Far-Right

1. Ideological Passion

1. Not agree at all
2. Very slightly agree
3. Slightly agree
4. Moderately agree
5. Mostly agree
6. Strongly agree
7. Very Strongly agree

1. My political involvement is well integrated in my life.
2. If I could, I would devote entirely to my politics.
3. My political involvement is in harmony with other things that are part of me.
4. Politics is so exciting that I sometimes lose control over it.
5. I have the impression that my political involvement controls me.
6. My political involvement is in harmony with the other activities in my life.

7. I have difficulties controlling my urge to think about politics.
8. The new things that I discover about politics allow me to appreciate it even more.
9. I have almost an obsessive feeling for politics.
10. My political involvement reflects the qualities I like about myself.
11. My political involvement allows me to live a variety of experiences.
12. Politics is the only thing that captivates me.
13. I invest a lot of time in politics.
14. I like politics.
15. Politics is important for me.
16. Politics is a passion for me.

2. Expo-12 (see Study 1A)

3. Support for Political Violence

1. Not agree at all
2. Very slightly agree
3. Slightly agree
4. Moderately agree
5. Mostly agree
6. Strongly agree
7. Very Strongly agree

1. Joining a radical activist group to do risky or illegal actions in order to help the far-right.
2. Forming a radical group to crack down on the far-left.
3. Physically attack someone from the far-left.
4. Appealing to acts of sabotage against the far-left.
5. Using any means, even violent ones, to help the far-right.

Supplementary Tables

Table S1. Demographic Characteristics of the Study 1 and Study 2 Samples

Characteristic	Study 1A (*n* = 257)	Study 1B (*n* = 250)	Study 1C (*n* = 264)	Study 1D (*n* = 153)	Study 2 (*n* = 593)
Gender, n (%)					
Women	136 (52.9)	129 (51.6)	126 (47.7)	67 (43.8)	330 (55.6)
Men	118 (45.9)	121 (48.4)	136 (51.5)	86 (56.2)	263 (44.4)
Other	3 (1.2)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Age, M (SD)	43.78 (12.87)	43.27 (11.74)	41.97 (11.09)	32.81 (8.80)[a]	46.36 (13.39)
Race/ethnicity, n (%)					
White	186 (72.4)	210 (84.0)	—	—	531 (89.5)
Black	29 (11.3)	6 (2.4)	—	—	19 (3.2)
Asian	27 (10.5)	12 (4.8)	—	—	16 (2.7)
Hispanic	11 (4.3)	14 (5.6)	—	—	20 (3.4)
Native American	0 (0.0)	1 (0.4)	—	—	0 (0.0)
Pacific Islander	0 (0.0)	1 (0.4)	—	—	1 (0.2)
Other	4 (1.6)	6 (2.4)	—	—	6 (1.0)

Note. Study 1A = Democrats; 1B = Republicans; 1C = environmental activists; 1D = Muslims; Study 2 = far-right Americans. Gender and race/ethnicity are self-reported frequency counts; percentages are of the column *n*. A dash (—) indicates the characteristic was not assessed: race/ethnicity was not collected in the environmental-activist (1C) and Muslim (1D) samples. Study 2 values are for the analytic sample (*N* = 593). [a] Age was available for 149 of the 153 Muslim participants; all other variables are complete at *N* = 153.

Table S2. Study 1 Measurement Models: Four-Factor EXPO-12 Solution and the Seeking–Action Correlation

Sample	χ^2	*df*	CFI	Active seeking–active action *r* [95% CI]	RMSEA [90% CI]	SRMR
1A Democrats (*n* = 257)	156.76	48	.971	.98 [.92, 1.01]	.094 [.078, .111]	.030
1B Republicans (*n* = 250)	174.27	48	.971	.84 [.66, .95]	.103 [.087, .119]	.026
1C Environmental (*n* = 264)	132.04	48	.975	.95 [.85, 1.00]	.082 [.065, .098]	.044
1D Muslims (*n* = 153)	108.53	48	.980	1.00 (inadmissible)	.091 [.068, .114]	.016

Note. Four-factor model: active seeking, active action, incidental online, and incidental offline exposure. In Study 1D the four-factor solution was inadmissible (non-positive-definite covariance matrix); the seeking–action estimate (1.00) is the point value from that solution, for which no bootstrap confidence interval is available. Confidence intervals are bias-corrected percentile bootstrap (5,000 resamples). Fit indices for the inadmissible Study 1D solution are reported for completeness. SRMR = standardized root mean square residual.

Table S3. Study 1 Measurement Models: Deliberate Engagement, Incidental Exposure, and Support for Violence

Sample	χ^2	*df*	CFI	RMSEA	Engagement–violence *r* [95% CI]	SRMR
1A Democrats (*n* = 257)	522.29	113	.923	.119 [.109, .129]	.82 [.64, .93]	.041
1B Republicans (*n* = 250)	952.46	113	.863	.173 [.163, .183]	.80 [.59, .93]	.052
1C Environmental (*n* = 264)	438.00	113	.931	.105 [.094, .115]	.70 [.45, .85]	.061
1D Muslims (*n* = 153)	417.59	114	.931	.132 [.119, .146]	.83 [.69, .94]	.137

Note. Model comprises a merged deliberate-engagement factor (active-seeking plus active-action items), incidental online exposure, incidental offline exposure, and support for political violence. In Study 1D, *df* = 114 because the violence factor was identified by fixing its first loading rather than its variance; in that sample the incidental factors also correlated substantially with violence (*r* = .65 online; *r* = .77 offline). Confidence intervals are bias-corrected percentile bootstrap (5,000 resamples). SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; 90% confidence intervals accompany RMSEA.

Table S4. Model-Building Sequence and Fit for the Random-Intercept Cross-Lagged Panel Models (Study 2, N = 593)

Model	χ^2 (df)	p	CFI	RMSEA [90% CI]	SRMR
Obsessive passion–deliberate engagement					
A. Unconstrained lagged paths, no covariates	0.49 (3)	.920	1.00	.000 [.000, .000]	.008
B. Lagged paths equal across waves, no covariates	3.34 (7)	.852	1.00	.000 [.000, .051]	.018
C. B + harmonious passion and commitment on random intercepts (reported model)	12.43 (11)	.333	1.00	.014 [.000, .064]	.018
D. C + identity fusion on random intercepts (robustness)	16.38 (15)	.357	1.00	.010 [.000, .057]	.018
E. C with the two cross-lagged paths constrained equal	11.99 (12)	.446	1.00	.000 [.000, .058]	.018
Obsessive passion–support for political violence					
A. Unconstrained lagged paths, no covariates	2.27 (3)	.519	1.00	.000 [.000, .154]	.022
B. Lagged paths equal across waves, no covariates	3.55 (7)	.829	1.00	.000 [.000, .063]	.025
C. B + harmonious passion and commitment on random intercepts (reported model)	10.98 (11)	.445	1.00	.000 [.000, .061]	.020
D. C + identity fusion on random intercepts (robustness)	15.52 (15)	.415	1.00	.000 [.000, .056]	.017
E. C with the two cross-lagged paths constrained equal	11.28 (12)	.505	1.00	.000 [.000, .055]	.020

Note. All models estimated in lavaan with maximum likelihood, robust (Huber–White) standard errors, and scaled test statistics (MLR); missing data handled by full-information maximum likelihood. All models constrain within-person residual variances to be equal across Waves 2–3 (stationarity); this constraint was supported against the free-variance alternative (obsessive passion–engagement: $\Delta\chi^2(2) = 1.17$, $p = .557$; obsessive passion–violence: $\Delta\chi^2(2) = 1.77$, $p = .412$) and was required for an admissible solution in the engagement model. Scaled (Satorra–Bentler) difference tests: A vs. B — engagement $\Delta\chi^2(4) = 2.64$, $p = .621$; violence $\Delta\chi^2(4) = 1.03$, $p = .905$. C vs. E — engagement $\Delta\chi^2(1) = 0.13$, $p = .721$; violence $\Delta\chi^2(1) = 0.02$, $p = .888$.

Table S5. Parameter Estimates for the Obsessive Passion–Deliberate Engagement RI-CLPM (Reported Model C; Study 2, N = 593)

Parameter	B	95% CI	p	β
Within-person lagged effects (constrained equal across waves)				
Obsessive passion → obsessive passion (AR)	.16	[-.13, .45]	.266	.19
Engagement → Engagement (AR)	-.31	[-.48, -.14]	< .001	-.44
Obsessive passion → Engagement	.25	[.01, .48]	.042	.44
Engagement → obsessive passion	.29	[.02, .55]	.036	.26
Cross-lag difference (reverse − forward)	.04	[-.18, .26]	.725	-.18
Within-person (co)variances				
Obsessive passion, Wave 1 variance	.42	[.24, .60]	< .001	1.00
Engagement, Wave 1 variance	.26	[.11, .41]	.001	1.00
Obsessive passion, residual variance Waves 2–3 (equal)	.26	[.17, .35]	< .001	.84
Engagement, residual variance Waves 2–3 (equal)	.11	[.06, .15]	< .001	.83
Wave-1 within-person covariance	.18	[.03, .33]	.018	.55
Wave-2 residual covariance	.11	[.01, .21]	.034	.66
Wave-3 residual covariance	.03	[-.04, .11]	.393	.19
Between-person (trait) components				
Random-intercept covariance (correlation in β column)	.26	[.11, .41]	.001	.56
Random-intercept variance: obsessive passion	.41	[.23, .59]	< .001	.40
Random-intercept variance: Engagement	.52	[.34, .69]	< .001	.83
Time-invariant covariates → random intercepts				
Harmonious passion → obsessive passion intercept	.01	[-.06, .08]	.790	.01
Commitment → obsessive passion intercept	.53	[.45, .61]	< .001	.77
Harmonious passion → Engagement intercept	-.02	[-.07, .03]	.507	-.03
Commitment → Engagement intercept	.23	[.15, .31]	< .001	.44

Note. B = unstandardized estimate with robust (Huber–White) standard errors; 95% CIs are robust Wald intervals; β = standardized estimate (for the random-intercept covariance, β is the correlation). Estimation: MLR with full-information maximum likelihood in lavaan. Model fit is reported in Table S4. AR = autoregressive path.

Table S6. Parameter Estimates for the Obsessive Passion–Support for Political Violence RI-CLPM (Reported Model C; Study 2, N = 593)

Parameter	B	95% CI	p	β
Within-person lagged effects (constrained equal across waves)				
Obsessive passion → obsessive passion (AR)	.23	[-.02, .48]	.071	.28
Violence support → Violence support (AR)	.01	[-.24, .27]	.921	.02
Obsessive passion → Violence support	-.03	[-.26, .21]	.828	-.06
Violence support → obsessive passion	-.01	[-.39, .36]	.941	-.01
Cross-lag difference (reverse − forward)	.01	[-.15, .18]	.887	.04
Within-person (co)variances				
Obsessive passion, Wave 1 variance	.40	[.24, .57]	< .001	1.00
Violence support, Wave 1 variance	.23	[.05, .40]	.011	1.00
Obsessive passion, residual variance Waves 2–3 (equal)	.26	[.17, .34]	< .001	.92
Violence support, residual variance Waves 2–3 (equal)	.09	[.02, .15]	.009	1.00
Wave-1 within-person covariance	.08	[-.05, .20]	.227	.25
Wave-2 residual covariance	-.01	[-.13, .10]	.838	-.08
Wave-3 residual covariance	.02	[-.02, .06]	.414	.11
Between-person (trait) components				
Random-intercept covariance (correlation in β column)	.33	[.16, .50]	< .001	.58
Random-intercept variance: obsessive passion	.44	[.28, .60]	< .001	.41
Random-intercept variance: Violence support	.75	[.49, 1.00]	< .001	.87
Time-invariant covariates → random intercepts				
Harmonious passion → obsessive passion intercept	.01	[-.06, .09]	.732	.02
Commitment → obsessive passion intercept	.53	[.45, .61]	< .001	.76
Harmonious passion → Violence support intercept	-.03	[-.09, .03]	.350	-.04
Commitment → Violence support intercept	.24	[.15, .33]	< .001	.39

Note. B = unstandardized estimate with robust (Huber–White) standard errors; 95% CIs are robust Wald intervals; β = standardized estimate (for the random-intercept covariance, β is the correlation). Estimation: MLR with full-information maximum likelihood in lavaan. Model fit is reported in Table S4. AR = autoregressive path.

Table S7. Robustness: Focal Estimates With Identity Fusion Added as a Trait-Level Covariate (Model D; Study 2, N = 593)

Estimate	OP–Engagement	OP–Violence
Obsessive passion → outcome (within-person)	.26 [.01, .51], p = .043	.00 [-.30, .30], p = .999
Outcome → obsessive passion (within-person)	.30 [.02, .57], p = .036	.03 [-.45, .51], p = .903
Cross-lag difference	.04 [-.19, .26], p = .743	.03 [-.18, .24], p = .777
Random-intercept correlation (β)	.45	.46
Fusion → outcome intercept	.25 [.18, .33], p < .001	.30 [.21, .39], p < .001
Fusion → obsessive passion intercept	.22 [.15, .29], p < .001	.22 [.15, .29], p < .001

Note. Model D adds identity fusion (across-wave mean) to harmonious passion and commitment as covariates of the random intercepts. Within-person estimates are unstandardized with robust 95% CIs. Full parameter listings are available in the analysis output on the OSF repository. Model fit: OP–Engagement $\chi^2(15) = 16.38$, p = .357, CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = .010, SRMR = .018; OP–Violence $\chi^2(15) = 15.52$, p = .415, CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = .000, SRMR = .017.

Table S8. Longitudinal Measurement Invariance Across the Three Waves (Study 2, N = 593)

Model	χ^2 (df)	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	$\Delta\chi^2$ (Δdf), p	ΔCFI
Obsessive passion (6 items)						
Configural	202.72 (114)	.976	.058	.037	—	—
Metric (equal loadings)	214.79 (124)	.975	.057	.049	11.49 (10), p = .321	−.001
Scalar (equal intercepts)	226.81 (134)	.975	.055	.049	6.32 (10), p = .788	.000
Deliberate engagement (6 items)						
Configural	386.04 (114)	.894	.154	.077	—	—
Metric (equal loadings)	375.45 (124)	.896	.146	.079	7.30 (10), p = .697	+.002
Scalar (equal intercepts)	401.12 (134)	.897	.140	.079	7.98 (10), p = .631	+.001
Support for political violence (5 items)						
Configural	105.36 (72)	.990	.055	.024	—	—
Metric (equal loadings)	114.40 (80)	.987	.058	.059	9.70 (8), p = .287	−.003
Scalar (equal intercepts)	124.95 (88)	.987	.056	.059	6.94 (8), p = .543	.000

Note. Longitudinal confirmatory factor models with one factor per wave and autocorrelated uniquenesses for repeated items; MLR estimation with full-information maximum likelihood. Fit indices are robust versions; $\Delta\chi^2$ are scaled (Satorra–Bentler) difference tests against the preceding step. All invariance constraints satisfied conventional criteria (nonsignificant scaled $\Delta\chi^2$ and ΔCFI ≤ .01; Chen, 2007; Cheung & Rensvold, 2002). The modest absolute fit of the engagement configural model reflects severe floor effects in these items (the scaled test statistic was less than one fourth of its normal-theory counterpart) and the seeking–action substructure documented in Study 1; the invariance constraints themselves were fully supported.

Table S9. Monte Carlo Power Sensitivity for the Within-Person Obsessive Passion → Violence Cross-Lagged Path (Study 2)

Population cross-lag (B)	Power (α = .05)	Converged replications
.05	.15	300 / 300
.10	.47	300 / 300
.15	.80	300 / 300
.20	.96	300 / 300
.25	1.00	300 / 300

Note. Data were simulated from the reported obsessive passion–violence RI-CLPM as the population model, preserving the estimated trait structure and within-person variances, with attrition imposed at the observed retention rates (593 → 443 → 347) as random monotone dropout on each replication (the simulation benchmarks sensitivity under these retention rates and does not model covariate-dependent missingness); models were re-estimated with the reported specification (MLR, FIML). Power is the proportion of converged replications in which the obsessive passion → violence within-person cross-lag was significant at α = .05. The design afforded .80 power at B ≈ .15.